

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 21-22, and 25 are amended, and claims 31-36 are added.

**I. Specification**

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the terminology "FB-MFD". The terminology should be spelled out in its entirety. Additionally, the Action asserts that the word "recording" is misspelled on page 6, line 20. The Office Action also asserts the following informalities: "hinges" 107 is not in figure 10; figure 12 should be labeled figure 11; "ADF Mechanism" 102 is not in figure 11; "feed tray" 104 is not in figure 11; "document discharge tray" 103 is not in figure 10; and step 270 is not in figure 4.

The Applicant has amended the Abstract, Disclosure, and Drawings in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections.

**II. Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) because the Action asserts that they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: specifically, reference numbers 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31 and 33. We respectfully traverse the objection. The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to figure 1 for the above listed reference numbers.

**III. Informalities**

The Office Action asserts that claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: There should not be a period after the words "predetermined value"; and the word ratio is misspelled. Claims 22 and 25 are objected to for the misspelling of the word "recording".

The Applicant has amended the claims based on the Examiner's recommendation. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections.

**IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-10 and 12-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 2000-175030 to Satoshi (hereinafter "Satoshi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Satoshi discloses the features of claim 1 as follows (in-part): "A recording unit which forms an image in a predetermined recording area on a recording medium on the basis of one of the image data generated by the reading unit and the reduced image data generated by the reducing unit," (Satoshi, claim 5, lines 2-4).

Based on the partial English translation of Satoshi, it is clear that the recording unit recited in claim 1 of the present invention does not correspond to the inputting apparatus of Satoshi. Specifically, the inputting apparatus of Satoshi accepts input of information regarding the size of a document, is connected to the controlling apparatus; and the printable region size acquiring means acquires the size of the printable region on a basis of the information input through the inputting apparatus and the controlling apparatus. The recording unit of the present invention forms an image in a predetermined recording area on a recording medium on the basis of one of the image data generated by the reading unit and the reduced image data generated by the reducing unit.

The Office Action goes on to assert that when the recording unit (of the present invention) forms the image on the basis of the reduced image data, the reading unit reads an extended reading area of the document larger than the recording area, correlates to claims 12 and 13 of Satoshi. However, claim 12 of Satoshi deals with an arranging means that adjusts the start position of printing, which uses the print data, in the printing apparatus.

Referring specifically to claim 22, the Office Action asserts that Satoshi teaches a control section which compares the reduction ratio with a threshold value (Satoshi, claim 1, lines 10-12). The Office Action's reference to Satoshi identifies a variable power means for expanding or reducing the image on in accordance with the variable power-scaling factor determined by scaling factor determining means. This does not correspond to the present invention's control section, which compares the reduction ratio with a threshold value. Furthermore, the Office Action attempts to correlate the data processing section (of the present invention) which reduces the image data on the basis of a comparison result provided by the control section, the image data, and the effective area to that of Satoshi. The reference specifically identifies that Satoshi processes the image data generated by the reading apparatus; or processing the image data on a basis of the variable power-scaling factor. Therefore, the reference relied on by the Office Action does not correspond to the present invention.

Furthermore, the Office Action attempts to correlate a recording section (of the present invention) which forms an image on a recording area of a recording medium on the basis of the image data reduced by the data processing section with Satoshi (claim 5, lines 2-4). The specific reference relied on identifies an inputting apparatus which accepts input of information regarding the size of the document, is connected to the controlling apparatus; and the printable region size acquiring means acquires the size of the printable region on a basis of the information input through the inputting apparatus and the controlling apparatus.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1, 12 and 22. Dependent claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-36 depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 12 and 22. Therefore, the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

**V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,613,017 to Rao et al. (hereinafter "Rao"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Satoshi fails to teach, "a buffer which temporarily stores the image data generated by the reading unit before outputting the image data to the reducing unit or the recording unit; and a preparatory reducing unit which thins out the image data before storing the image data in the buffer." The Office Action relies on Rao, which it asserts discloses a buffer which temporarily stores the image data generated by the reading unit before outputting the image data to the reducing unit or the recording unit. The Office Action goes on to assert that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Satoshi's invention based on the teachings of Rao.

Rao does not make up for the features discussed above with regard to independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 11, which depends from claim 1, is also in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Eric D. Morehouse  
Registration No. 38,565

JAO:KDB/brp

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: December 12, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---